

# **Iowa**

# **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

# **ADVISORY PANEL**

## **Annual Report 2008 - 2009**



### **VISION STATEMENT**

All children in Iowa, as members of communities, shall receive opportunities and needed supports for meaningful lives and quality education experiences.

(2007)

State of Iowa  
**Department of Education**  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St  
Des Moines IA 50319-0146

### **State Board of Education**

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton  
Vacant

### **Administration**

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

### **Student and Family Support Services**

Lana Michelson, Bureau Chief  
Dennis Dykstra, Administrative Consultant  
Sonia Lewis, Secretary  
Eric Neessen, Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the *Iowa Code* sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688) Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St, Des Moines IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.

# Table of Contents

	Page
Mission Statement, Purpose, Duties . . . . .	3
Membership . . . . .	4
Annual Priorities . . . . .	6
Indicator Updates . . . . .	6
Workshops to the Panel . . . . .	10
Related Activities . . . . .	16
Meeting Dates . . . . .	17
Acronyms/Terms . . . . .	18
SPP / APR Part B Indicators . . . . .	20
Contact Information . . . . .	21

# SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY PANEL

---

## MISSION STATEMENT

The Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel serves as a resource to advise the Iowa Department of Education on behalf of all children with special needs and their families. This Panel engages in dialogue regarding philosophies and policies, including best practices and special education compliance that result in successful outcomes for persons with disabilities. (2007)

---

## PURPOSE:

“The purpose of the Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel is to provide policy guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities.”

## DUTIES:

- a) Advise state education agency on unmet needs;
- b) Comment publicly on any rules and regulations proposed by the state;
- c) Advise State Education Agency (SEA) in developing evaluations and reporting data to the U.S. Department of Education Secretary under section 618 of the Act;
- d) Advise SEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of this Act;
- e) Advise SEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services.

34 C.F.R. §300.169 (2006)

# 2008-2009 MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Panel consists of representatives from both public and private sectors who, by virtue of their position, interest, and training, can contribute to the education of children with disabilities. A majority (51%) of the members of the Panel must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. The Director of the Iowa Department of Education (DE) appoints members to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). Members of the SEAP for 2008-2009 are as follows:

## **Executive Committee:**

**Julie Jensen** – Chair

**Vicki Goshan** – Vice-Chair

**Lana Michelson** – Bureau Chief, Student and Family Support Services

**Eric Neessen** – Panel Facilitator

## **Panel Staff:**

**Dennis Dykstra** – Administrative Consultant (DE)

**Sonia Lewis** – Panel Secretary (DE)

## **Panel Members:**

MEMBER		ROLE
1	<b>Kyla Alba</b>	Parent of child with a disability Parent Educator Connection
2	<b>Randy Allison</b>	AEA director of special education
3	<b>Ruth Allison</b>	Vocational Rehabilitation Services
4	<b>Erik Anderson</b>	Individual with a disability
5	<b>Jeff Anderson</b>	State child welfare agency responsible for foster care
6	<b>Suzanne Blomme</b>	Urban Education Network Administrator of programs for children with disabilities
7	<b>Lucy Evans</b>	Parent of child with a disability School administrator
8	<b>Jennifer Gomez</b>	Parent of child with a disability
9	<b>Diana Gonzalez</b>	Board of Regents
10	<b>Vicki Goshon</b>	Parent of child with a disability Teacher
11	<b>Paul Greene</b>	Parent of child with a disability

<b>MEMBER</b>		<b>ROLE</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Chuck Hinz</b>	Post-Secondary/Community Colleges
<b>13</b>	<b>Julie Jensen</b>	Local Official – Homeless Assistance Act Administrator of programs for children with disabilities
<b>14</b>	<b>Jane Kinney</b>	Private school representative Administrator
<b>15</b>	<b>Michelle Laughlin</b>	Individual with a disability
<b>16</b>	<b>Jon Muller</b>	Middle school guidance counselor
<b>17</b>	<b>Susan Myers</b>	PTI (Executive Director)
<b>18</b>	<b>John O’Brien</b>	Juvenile Corrections
<b>19</b>	<b>Keri Osterhaus</b>	Department for the Blind
<b>20</b>	<b>Jule Reynolds</b>	Parent of child with a disability
<b>21</b>	<b>W. Ray Richardson</b>	Superintendent – retired
<b>22</b>	<b>Beth Rydberg</b>	Protection & Advocacy Parent of child with a disability
<b>23</b>	<b>Sandra Smith</b>	Adult correctional facility
<b>24</b>	<b>LaShell Staley</b>	Parent of child with a disability
<b>25</b>	<b>Ruth Stieff</b>	Private school parent Parent of child with a disability
<b>26</b>	<b>Susan Stock</b>	Parent of child with a disability Teacher
<b>27</b>	<b>Lisa Woiwood</b>	Parent of child with a disability

**Of the 27 members, 14 members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.**

# Annual Priorities

## Priorities:

- To provide guidance regarding issues related to special education in Iowa.
- To review the Annual Performance Report indicators, provide input, and help set appropriate and ambitious targets, when necessary.

## Indicator Updates

Since one of the priorities of the Special Education Advisory Panel is to review the APR indicator data, provide input, and set targets, much time was spent discussing these issues. Listed below is a brief summary of the panel discussion involving each indicator over the course of the year.

### **Indicator B1: Graduation – Barbara Ohlund (DE)**

This indicator compares the graduation rates of students with disabilities with those students who do not have disabilities. Data show that the gap is currently at 15.25, which is slightly higher than the previous year, and still above the goal of 10.70. Disaggregated AEA data show a gap ranging from 20.57 to 9.92.

### **Indicator B2: Dropout – Barbara Ohlund (DE)**

This indicator compares the dropout rates of students with disabilities with those students who do not have disabilities. Data indicate that the gap has remained the same for the past two years at 0.35. This is below the state established goal of 0.60. Disaggregated AEA data show a gap range 1.30 to -0.28.

### **Indicator B3: Participation and Performance – Amy Williamson (DE), Marty Ikeda (DE), and Corwyn Moore (DE)**

This indicator examines the data regarding the participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments. Number of districts who meet data indicate a significant drop in the percent of districts meeting AYP goals in reading and math in grades 4-8 and 11.

- a) Participation – Improvement was seen in all grade levels and the targets were met.
- b) Proficiency - Scores in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading did not meet the target and did not improve from the previous year. All other grades did show improvement in reading and did meet the target. Scores in 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade math did not meet the target and improvement was not seen. All other grades did show improvement in math and did meet the target.

Some of the activities outlined to support improved performance include: Every Student Counts (ESC), Instructional Decision Making (IDM), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Reading First, Second Chance Reading, Question-Answer-Relationships (QAR), Concept Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI). Additionally, all consultants at the DE are working on aligning efforts to support the roll-out of the Iowa Core Curriculum.

**Indicator B4: Suspension and Expulsion – Sandy Nelson (DE)**

This indicator tracks the number of suspensions beyond 10 days that students with disabilities have received over the school year. Expulsion data are also collected. The percent of districts with an average suspension/expulsion rate greater than the threshold was at 2.75%, which is greater than the state goal of 1.50%. Many improvement activities have been, and are being, implemented to decrease the number of students with disabilities who are being suspended and expelled. Some of these activities include LEAs writing and implementing Corrective Action Plans; professional learning for AEA and LEA staff; implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports; reviewing and adjusting district policies and procedures; and addressing building-wide discipline concerns for all students, not just for students with special needs.

Corrective Action Plans were written and implemented by districts that were identified as having exceeded the state average for suspending or expelling students with IEPs for more than 10 days within the previous school year. These forms were distributed to the SEAP members for review. Members expressed concern about the accuracy of the suspension data. Project Easier data are used to gather that information and verification mechanisms are currently not imbedded into that program. It was also stated that “suspension” needs to be clearly defined to ensure consistent application and data.

**Indicator B5: Least Restrictive Environment School Aged Children (ages 6-21) – Amy Williamson (DE)**

This indicator reviews whether children with IEPs are receiving their instruction in the most inclusive environment possible. The data for 2007-2008 revealed the following:

- a) The percentage of children with IEPs who are removed from the general education classroom less than 21% of the time went up from 55.05% to 59.97% in one year. This exceeds the state target of 50%.
- b) The percentage of children with IEPs removed from the general education classroom more than 60% of the day went down from 9.09% to 8.03% in one year. This is less than the state target of 13%.
- c) The percentage of children with IEPs ages 6-21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements went down from 3.90% to 3.47% in one year. This is less than the state target of 3.70%.

**Indicator B6: 3-5 Least Restrictive Environment – Amy Williamson (DE)**

Per OSEP guidance, we do not have to report on this indicator.

**Indicator B7: Early Childhood Outcomes – Dee Gethmann (DE)**

This indicator provides information about children ages three to five who have IEPs. Of the 169 children whose progress data was available, data reveal the following information in the three categories reported:

- a) Improved Social-Emotional Skills - there were increases in “maintained” and “improved and comparable to peers.”
- b) Improved Acquisition and use of Knowledge and Skills - there were increases in “improved and nearer to peers” and “improved and comparable to peers.”
- c) Improved Use of Appropriate Behaviors - there were increases in “maintained” and “improved and comparable.”



The improvement activities implemented over the year included ongoing training on early childhood outcomes as well as requiring early childhood outcome information on the Educational Evaluation Report form.

**Indicator B8: Parent Involvement – Deb Samson (DE)**

Parents of children receiving special education services were asked to provide their opinion on how schools and AEAs facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services. Survey results show that for parents of preschool children, the satisfaction rating was 78.05%, which is an improvement from the previous year of 72.5%. Overall, six of the 10 AEAs showed an improvement for this age range. Likewise, for parents of students K-12, the satisfaction rating was 69.09%, which is an improvement from the previous year of 61%. There were approximately 800 paper and phone surveys sent to parents of preschoolers and approximately 1,000 surveys sent to parents of K-12<sup>th</sup> grade students. The panel provided input on additional ways in which to gather information and ensure accuracy.

**Indicator B9: Disproportionate Representation – Amy Williamson (DE)**

The purpose of this indicator is to make certain that an ethnicity group is neither under nor over-represented in Special Education. This year one AEA was identified as having an over-representation of African-Americans represented in special education. This AEA, which has been identified in both the weighted risk ratio and the gap categories, is required to review policies, procedures, and practices. The DE will provide assistance and monitoring of this AEA.

**Indicator B10: Disproportionality/Disability Category – Amy Williamson (DE)**

Per OSEP guidance, we do not have to report on this indicator.

**Indicator B11: 60-day Timeline for Evaluation – Eric Neessen (DE)**

This indicator requires initial evaluations for special education to be completed within 60 calendar days. The state must report on the number of children evaluated, the number determined eligible, the number determined not eligible, and any reasons why any evaluation was not completed within the 60-day time limit. While OSEP set the target at 100% compliance, the state results were at 94.28%. This is an improvement from the previous two years. Out of the 10 AEAs, six had results above 95%, while only one AEA showed a decline. The panel provided many improvement suggestions. The panel agreed that parent input should be gathered in a separate form along with the Eligibility Data Worksheet. Many felt 60 calendar days is a sufficient length of time to complete the evaluation.

**Indicator B12: Transition C to B – Dee Gethmann (DE)**

This indicator measures the percentage of eligible children (ages birth through two) who had IEPs developed by age three. The data showed that this goal was met for 88.12% of children by the age of three. Although this was an increase from the previous year, the target for this indicator is 100%. The disaggregated AEA data revealed there was a range from 71.72 to 98.31. The reasons for the delay included: family reason, hospitalization, mutual agreement, moved, no valid reason, and parent refusal. These “delay” reasons occurred in 120 instances.

**Indicator B13: Secondary Transition – Amy Williamson (DE)**

This indicator measures the IEP goals and transition services that will prepare students (ages 16 and older) to meet post-secondary goals of living, learning and working. Thirty-five percent of all IEPs met Indicator B13 criteria, which is an increase of 20% from the previous year. There was an increase in all six critical elements: Transition Assessments (+27%); Course of Study

(+21%); Goals (+20%); Preferences and Interests (+13%); Postsecondary Expectations (+25%); Services and Supports (+12%). AEA representatives commented on ongoing training that is occurring for their staff and LEA staff in all six elements. Noteworthy activities include more certified data collectors trained, more content coaches, and statewide and national usage of the transition assessment web tool.

**Indicator B14: Postsecondary Outcomes – Amy Williamson (DE)**

This indicator measures the percentage of students who had IEPs who are within one year of leaving high school and are now in postsecondary school, competitively employed, or both. Baseline postsecondary outcome data were collected for children with and without IEPs. The results of the 2007-08 data showed that similar rates of IEP and non-IEP students were working only; more non-IEP students were going to school only; more IEP students were neither going to school or working; and a similar percentage were both going to school and working. The activities for this coming year include increasing the response rate and participation, analyzing the data, and developing tools to increase access and use of data.

**Indicator B15: General Supervision – Sandy Nelson (DE)**

The purpose of this indicator is to measure whether or not any noncompliance issues are corrected within one year of identification. There were 14,672 findings of noncompliance in 2006-07 identified statewide through onsite visits, self-assessments, desk audits and due process procedures. Of these findings, all were corrected no later than one year from the identification date. Iowa System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) is being used for self-assessments and this information is integrated into a district's comprehensive school improvement site visit every five years.

**Indicators B16-19: Complaints, Hearings, Resolutions, and Mediations – Dee Ann Wilson (DE)**

The following indicators relate to due process requests and hearings:

*Indicator B16:* Iowa had six written complaints with five of them being withdrawn or dismissed.

*Indicator B17:* There is a 45 day timeline for hearings. The state met the 100% target. For 2007-2008, the following numbers are applicable:

- Hearing requests total 6
- Resolution sessions 5
- Settlement Agreements 5
- Hearings / Fully Adjudicated 0
- Decisions within timeline 0
- Decisions with extended timeline 0
- Resolved without a hearing 5

*Indicator B18*

Resolution sessions: Since Iowa had fewer than 10 cases, no report was required to be submitted to OSEP.

### *Indicator B19*

Iowa previously set its target at 75%-85% of preappeal conferences and mediations resulting in an agreement. The state exceeded that goal with 88.89% of conferences and mediations reaching agreement.

### **Indicator B20: Timely and Accurate Data – Amy Williamson (DE)**

This indicator measures whether the state-reported data are timely and accurate. The data for this revealed that the state met the 100% target of timely and accurate reports being submitted. The work this past year focused on LRE, 60-day timeline, and transition from C to B. The focus next year will be on graduation, dropout, race/ethnicity, and participation and performance. The current code for race/ethnicity will be reviewed and possibly reconfigured within the next year.

## **Workshops to the Panel**

In order to fulfill their role of advising the DE on special education issues, Panel members felt they needed to stay current on key aspects of the special education system in Iowa. During the year, DE staff involved with specific programs or projects were invited to present to the Panel. Members were frequently asked to provide feedback or make recommendations for specific issues discussed. Following is a brief synopsis of workshops and panel responses during this past year.

### **1) Bureau Updates – Lana Michelson (DE) and Dennis Dykstra (DE)**

An important item on every agenda included an update on current DE initiatives and activities within the Department and the Bureau of Student and Family Support Services. This ongoing agenda item kept Panel members up-to-date on national, state and AEA initiatives and policy changes; trends in special/general education; and legislative concerns. Topics discussed included:

- A review of Iowa's APR indicators, progress toward goals, and targets from previous year
- Section 616 Determination letter that describes the criteria by which to assign a determination to an AEA or LEA per OSEP
- Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) associated with the 15% Part B funding dollars. This is tied to significant disproportionality, Title 1 dollars and Title III (English Language Learners) dollars.
- Shortage of hearing interpreters across the state and efforts to address that shortage
- Child Find steering committee work
- Autism council activities and a bill presented to the state legislature
- Stimulus package of \$13 billion for IDEA activities over a two-year period being considered by the U.S. Congress entitled American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The panel was encouraged to draft a letter to express their opinion.
- Formation of the Iowa Autism Council in response to a legislative mandate. The group's first meeting was Oct. 30, 2008.
- Update on ARRA stimulus funding and the information that can be found on the DE website

- APR update and OSEP determination that Iowa has “met requirements” for the FFY 2007-2008.

Additionally, guidance was sought from the panel regarding APR/SPP indicators that were below target and for AEAs and LEAs found to be “noncompliant.” The focus of the discussion was how to address those indicators that were found to be in the 75-95% range. The panel recommended that the DE require an AEA and/or LEA to write and implement a “corrective action plan.”

## 2) **Legal Updates – Thomas Mayes (DE)**

Legal issues and policy development are directly correlated. The panel received regular updates about state and national legal proceedings and outcomes that were relevant to the panel discussions. Topics in these updates included:

- Review of the updated Iowa Administrative Rules for Special Education and alignment to Federal Regulations
- Review of public meetings rules and policies
- Foster care legislation regarding educational stability regarding attendance and transportation
- Amendments to the 2006 IDEA Regulations
  - Parent Revocation of Consent for IDEA Services
  - Lay advocates at Due Process Hearings
  - Correction of non-compliance
  - Public reporting of AEA/LEA performance on SPP
  - Public attention of OSEP Enforcement Actions
- Seclusion and restraint revisions to state regulations
- Americans with Disabilities Act amendment that broadens the scope of what is considered a major life activity
- Higher Education Act that provides programs for general education teachers to be prepared to teach students with IEPs
- Supreme Court’s tuition reimbursement case
- Childhood vaccine cases and the link between autism and Thimerasol
- Public meeting booklets – open meetings and open records
  - All meetings are open to the public
  - Notice of meetings are made public
- Rulemaking per OSEP – revocation of consent and declaratory ruling
- Update on federal committee reviewing state seclusion and restraint policies
- Legislative issues pertaining to special education
- Proposed changes to Iowa Rules of Special Education
  - Technical and mandated changes
  - Child find and general education intervention changes
  - Parents’ right to withdraw child from special education
  - Progress monitoring rules for children in general education, special education, and who are being determined eligible or not eligible for special education
  - Records must be retained at least 5 years after activity is completed

- 3) **LEA and AEA Determinations – Amy Williamson (DE) and Meredith MacQuigg (DE)**  
Amy explained where the data is gathered at the state level and how the data are used. These collection repositories include Information Management System (IMS), Project Easier, and I-Star. Amy and Meredith went over the data on the LEA and AEA Determinations charts and explained the data on each of the charts. They also explained that the state is able to set certain criteria, but OSEP has established compliance indicators that must be met.
- 4) **Suspension and Expulsion Plan – Sandy Nelson (DE)**  
Sandy went over Indicator B4 Suspension /Expulsion data. She asked the panel to discuss the information in small groups and then provide input. Specifically, she requested feedback on what action the Department of Education should take concerning two districts (who are in their second year of “needing assistance”). Some suggestions the panel made for support included: establish a process that fosters collaboration of the district with the DE; acknowledge the progress of the district; provide technical assistance to teachers and other stakeholders from the district; begin the process with a visit from key support people from the DE and key district representatives; have a DE staff member that is the on-going contact for the district; and create a Corrective Action Plan that addresses sustainability.
- 5) **15% Early Intervening Services Data and Guidance Document – Dennis Dykstra (DE) and Lana Michelson (DE)**  
Lana explained how the LEAs are allowed to use up to 15% of their special education (Part B) dollars to provide early intervening services to students without IEPs who are struggling. However, when it is determined that a district has a “significantly” higher percentage of minority students in special education who have been identified, disciplined, or restrictively placed, then these 15% funds must be used to correct those issues. It was explained that the information that is used comes from the certified enrollment data that schools submit on October 1<sup>st</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> of each year.
- 6) **Low Incidence Disability Workgroup – Emily Thatcher (DE)**  
Emily presented a plan that has been developed to increase communication and literacy development in students who have low-incidence disabilities. Additionally, the goals of this plan are to improve student outcomes through ensuring that low-incidence students will have a communication system in place; be able to make choices; and have a high level of self-help skills. All of these efforts should increase student proficiency on the Iowa alternate assessment.
- 7) **30 day comment – Amy Williamson (DE)**  
Amy presented on the proposed changes OSEP is making to Part B SPP/APR indicators. OSEP is allowing states 30 days to submit comments to the proposed changes.
- 8) **Iowa Guidance for Quality IEPs website – Sharon Hawthorne and Kiersten Hensley (DE)**  
Sharon and Kiersten shared information about the newly developed website that will help special education practitioners be able to guide teams as they develop IEPs. The webpage can be on the Iowa Department of Education website.

**9) Iowa Core Curriculum – Rita Martens (DE)**

Rita provided the panel with updates on the legislatively mandated efforts to improve teaching and learning by ensuring that all Iowa students engage in a rigorous and relevant curriculum. Rita provided an overview of the essential skills and concepts covered in the areas of literacy, math, social studies, science, and 21<sup>st</sup> century skills (which include civic literacy, financial literacy, technological literacy, health literacy, and employability). Many of these areas are still being developed this year.

**10) Iowa Legislative Discussion – Jeff Berger (DE)**

Jeff was invited by the panel to provide information on the educationally relevant topics that would be considered within the Iowa legislature this coming session. He reported that much of the pre-legislative discussions involved the shortfall in revenue and what impact this might have on state education funding. Federally, the economic predictions are also very bleak. He reported that flat funding would be seen as a victory given the forecast. Jeff reported that the state legislature is still holding firm to a strong commitment to education. Ten education bills being submitted during this session will be policy items that can be adjusted without impacting funding.

**11) Weighted Matrix – Julie Schendel (Heartland AEA 11)**

Julie explained how the “weighted matrix” is used by AEAs when determining what additional funding is necessary to support children within special education. The four major areas determined within the matrix include: curricular modifications; specially designed instruction; support for school personnel and LRE environmental efforts; and supplementary aids and services/specialized transportation. There are three levels of additional weighting which would respectively add a 0.71, 1.21, and 2.74 funding to the normal 1.0 weight given to each Iowa student.

**12) District Developed Plan – Kiersten Hensley (DE)**

Kiersten explained how every school district would need to review, rewrite, or revise their district developed plan for special education. This plan would describe how the district is going to provide the full continuum of services for both K-12 and preschool students who are eligible for special education services. Within this document would be a description of the system for delivering special education instructional services, special education caseload, concerns regarding caseload, the process used to evaluate effectiveness of the plan and the procedures used to arrive at those decisions.

**13) Economic Stimulus Funding Update – Dennis Dykstra (DE) and John Lee (DE)**

Dennis and John shared information about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). These federal funding dollars will be used to support AEAs, LEAs, and State Operated Programs (SOPs). These ARRA dollars total \$122 million, which is in addition to the basic Part B \$121 million that the state is slated to receive for normal operating expenses for 2009-10. Of this new \$122 million, the AEAs will receive approximately \$48.8 million and the LEAs will receive \$73.1 million. The money must be spent by September of 2011. The intent of this money is to 1) save and create jobs, and 2) increase student achievement. No money will be allocated to be used by the DE nor can the DE tell the AEAs and LEAs how to use the money. The federal government has asked that the money be used innovatively and transparently. Each state is required to report what they have done with the

money within 10 days of the end of each fiscal quarter. A provision within this effort includes a “maximum maintenance of effort reduction.” These are dollars that could be used to replace state and local dollars (up to 50% of ARRA dollars) so that those freed up state and local dollars can be used to support ESEA activities within the AEAs and LEAs. Additional information is provided through the guidance document on the DE website and webinars provided by the DE to AEAs and LEAs. The federal Government Accounting Office (GAO) will be monitoring Iowa’s use of funds on a regular basis.

**14) APR Update – Amy Williamson (DE) and Meredith MacQuigg (DE)**

Amy and Meredith provided an update on the APR data that was submitted in February 2009 to OSEP. The following information was provided to the SEAP members and questions were answered:

- LEA Determinations – The majority of district “met requirements” while four districts were on the “watch list” and nine districts were designated as “needing assistance.”
- Indicator B4 Suspension and Expulsion – Eleven districts were identified as being above the state average for suspending (for more than 10 days) or expelling students with disabilities at a higher rate than the state average.
- Continuous Early Intervening Services – Seven districts were identified as having significantly disproportionality issues in the areas of identification, placement, and discipline.
- SPP/APR updates – Changes in the APR reporting requirements for FFY 08 were reviewed indicator by indicator.

**15) Foster Care and Education – Jeffrey Anderson (DHS representative and SEAP member)**

Jeff shared information about children in foster care and the educational provisions that must be provided to those children in need of special education. Jeff shared information about the “Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008” as well as a brief “Questions and Answers” handout.

**16) Indicator B15 General Supervision Update – Sandy Nelson (DE)**

Sandy provided an update on the progress of two school districts (Newton and Clinton) that were identified as “schools in need of assistance for their special education indicators.” Both districts have gone through a process that is similar to the process that schools use when in the “needs assistance” phase. Both districts will have their Part B Corrective Action Plans ready to implement during the summer of 2009.

**17) Learning Supports Update – Barbara Ohlund (DE) and Cyndy Erickson (DE)**

Barbara and Cyndy provided the panel with a description of the Learning Supports efforts. The definition of Learning Supports is: “Enhancing a continuum of integrated supports for learning in order to promote (1) student learning in the Iowa Core Curriculum, (2) healthy development, and (3) success in school and in life.” The three content categories that will be a major focus this coming year include: supports for instruction; community partnerships; safe, healthy, and caring learning environments. The timelines for much of this work will be on a three-year (or longer) timeline. Collaborative efforts will be imperative in accomplishing the goals for improving and meeting the social, emotional, and behavioral

needs of children. The collaborative network will include those involved with Olweus, Character Counts, Positive Behavior and Intervention Supports, Instructional Decision Making, and others.

**18) Child Find update – Marty Ikeda (DE)**

Marty described the current efforts toward developing a common, uniform child find process for the state. He overviewed the work committees involved in developing the procedures as well as the four “big ideas” the work committees were clarifying. These questions include: When is a disability suspected? What is the role of general education interventions? What are the components of a comprehensive evaluation? What criteria are needed in which to make an eligibility determination? The panel was given time to ask clarifying questions and provide feedback. The panel agreed with the direction of the committees and are anxious to hear about the outcomes of these meetings.

**19) Reporting on Racial and Ethnic – Amy Williamson (DE)**

Amy reported on the new requirements set by OSEP to more accurately and consistently gather national data about student race and ethnicity. States are now obligated to answer the following two questions: 1) Is this student Hispanic/Latino? and 2) What is the student’s race?

**20) Video presentation: “Including Samuel”**

The panel reviewed a video developed by Dan Habib about his son, as well as several other students with disabilities. The panel members were then asked their views on this video, what they felt the main message was about, who needs to see the video, and how this video could be used in Iowa.

**21) Homeless presentation – Julie Jensen (SEAP chair and homeless representative)**

Julie presented about the problems created by homeless youth: issues such as mobility, coordination between service agencies and education, determining where services are provided, and collecting and using data. NASDSE held a policy forum and created a document entitled, “Homeless and Special Education Administrative Collaboration.” Julie distributed this document to panel members and summarized the information. Both Julie and Suzanne Blomme shared stories regarding the homeless situations resulting from the flooding in Cedar Rapids in 2008.



## **Related Activities**

This section outlines ongoing professional development opportunities for Panel members in topics related to special education and the work members are asked to do as part of their duties.

### **Conference/Workshop Attendance**

Panel members were invited to attend conferences and workshops held in Iowa that offered opportunities for them to learn about specific topics related to special education. Expenses for travel, lodging and registrations were reimbursed. The conferences/workshops attended by panel members included:

- Wrightslaw Conference in Altoona – Oct. 2008
- Nebraska/Kansas Regional Special Education Law Conf. in Omaha – Nov. 2008

Members attending the conferences shared their experiences and highlighted lessons learned during the regular Panel meetings.

# Meeting Dates

## 2008 – 2009

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
<b>September 25, 2008</b>	1:00pm – 7:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>September 26, 2008</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>October 31, 2008</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>December 5, 2008</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>January 23, 2009</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>April 24, 2009</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>June 5, 2009</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA

## 2009 - 2010

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
<b>September 17, 2009</b>	1:30pm – 7:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>September 18, 2009</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>October 30, 2009</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>December 4, 2009</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>January 22, 2010</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>April 23, 2010</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA
<b>June 4, 2010</b>	9:00am – 3:00pm	Stoney Creek Inn – Johnston, IA

# Acronyms/Terms

**AEA** – Area Education Agency

**ALJ** - Administrative Law Judge

**APR** – Annual Performance Report (as related to a state’s “State Performance Plan”)

**ARRA** – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

**AYP** – Adequate Yearly Progress

**I-CASE** – Iowa Council for Administrators of Special Education

**DE** – Iowa Department of Education

**District** – school district (also referred to as Local Educational Agency or LEA)

**ESEA** – Elementary and Secondary Education Act

**FFY** – Federal Fiscal Year

**HQT** – Highly Qualified Teacher

**IDEA, IDEA’04 or IDEA 2004** – Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004

**IDM** – Instructional Decision Making

**IEP** – Individualized Educational Program

**IMS** – Information Management System

**I-STAR** – Iowa System to Achieve Results

**ITBS/ITED** – Iowa Test of Basic Skills / Iowa Test of Educational Development

**IEP** – Individualized Education Program

**LEA** – Local Educational Agency (also called school districts)

**NCLB** – No Child Left Behind, a federal education law

**OSEP** – Office of Special Education Programs (Washington, D.C.)

**Panel** – Special Education Advisory Panel (also referred to as “SEAP”)

**Part B** – Special Education Services for Children with Disabilities Ages 3 to 21

**Part C** – Services for Children Birth through Two Years

**RtI** – Response to Intervention

**SEA** – State Education Agency

**SEAP** – Special Education Advisory Panel (also referred to as the “Panel”)

**SLP** – Speech and Language Pathologist

**SPP** – State Performance Plan (sometimes called the “Six-Year Performance Plan”)

## SPP/APR Part B Indicators

Indicator	Description
1	Improving graduation rates for students with disabilities
2	Decreasing dropout rates for students with disabilities
3	Ensuring all students with disabilities participate in statewide or alternate assessments
4	Reducing suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities
5	Providing services for students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment
6	Providing preschool children with disabilities services in the least restrictive environment
7	Improving cognitive and social outcomes for preschool children with disabilities
8	Improving parent involvement in their child's special education program
9	Reducing disproportionality of cultural groups in special education
10	Reducing the number of students from other cultures in certain disability categories
11	Ensuring evaluations are completed within 60 calendar days
12	Ensuring a smoother transition from preschool programs to school-based programs
13	Improving transition services for students with disabilities at the secondary level, beginning at age 14
14	Improving the outcomes for students moving from secondary to postsecondary activities
15	Making sure school districts correct noncompliance areas in their special education program within one year
16	Ensuring complaints filed by parents and other agencies are completed in a 60-day period
17	Ensuring due process hearings are completed in a 45-day period
18	Increasing the use of resolution sessions to resolve due process hearings
19	Increasing the use of mediation to resolve differences with the school
20	Making sure the data used by the State is timely and accurate

(Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center, 2007)

## **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Eric Neessen, Panel Facilitator  
Department of Education  
Bureau of Student and Family Support Services  
400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
Phone: 515-281-0345  
Fax: 515-242-6019  
E-mail: [Eric.Neessen@iowa.gov](mailto:Eric.Neessen@iowa.gov)